IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE, ANDHRA PRADESH
AT HYDERABAD

(Special Original Jurisdiction)

FRIDAY, THE TWENTY SECOND DAY OF JULY
TWO THOUSAND AND FIVE

PRESENT

THE HON'BLE MR JUSTICE S.ANANDA REDDY

-

WRIT PETITION NO : 14752 of 2005

Between:

M. Chenchaiah, S/o. Pullaiah,
R/o. D.No. 25/4329, 3rd Street, N.C.C. Colony, Podalakuru Road,
Nellore, Nellore District.

..... PETITIONER

AND

The Regional Manager, APSRTC, Nellore Region, Nellore District.

.....RESPONDENT

Petition under Article 226 of the constitution of India praying that in the circumstances stated in the Affidavit filed herein the High Court may be pleased to issue an order, direction or Writ more particularly one in the nature of Writ of Mandamus declaring the action of the respondents in not issuing the notice to the petitioner is as per clause 3.7 of circular No. PD.No. 43/2000, dt. 11-8-2000 as the same is illegal arbitrary, unjust and consequently direct the respondents to issue call letter as per circular PD.No. 43/2000, dt. 11-8-2000 and appoint the petitioner as Driver.

Counsel for the Petitioner: MR.G.RAVI MOHAN

Counsel for the Respondent: MR.R.MADAN MOHAN REDDY

The Court at the admission stage made the following:

ORDER:

This writ petition is filed aggrieved by the inaction of the respondent in considering the case of the petitioner for re-engagement in terms of Circular No.PD.No.43/2000, dated 11.08.2000.

According to the petitioner, he was appointed as a Driver in the respondent-Corporation in the year 1996. However, on verification, as the Corporation found that the driving licence produced by the petitioner was not genuine, the petitioner was removed from service. Later, the Corporation issued circular referred to above directing the drivers who were removed from service for possessing non-genuine licences to obtain fresh licences so as to consider their cases for re-engagement. It is stated that in conformity with the said circular, the petitioner obtained a fresh licence and submitted the same on 12.01.2001 along with other similarly placed persons. However, the petitioner has not received any communication or he has been re-engaged in the respondent-Corporation as a Driver, though the similarly situated persons have already been re-engaged by the respondent-Corporation. Hence, the present writ petition.

Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and the learned Standing Counsel appearing for the respondent.

As the grievance of the petitioner is that his case has not been considered for re-engagement even though he produced a fresh driving licence along with similarly situated persons in terms of circular, dated 11.08.2004, the respondent is directed to consider the case of the petitioner and pass appropriate orders expeditiously, preferably within a period of four weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.

The writ petition is accordingly disposed of. No costs.

_____

22.07.2005

VGB

To

1. The Regional Manager, APSRTC, Nellore Region, Nellore District.
2. 2CD copies.